

Remarks

The final Office Action mailed September 29, 2005 allowed claims 10, 13 and 16-25, and finally rejected claims 22-25.

The Applicant has hereinabove provided a minor post-final amendment to clarify the subject matter previously presented in claim 22. Support for this is found including in the specification at page 8, lines 12-18 and page 13, lines 7-11. This substitution in language merely clarifies without narrowing the scope of the claimed subject matter, and does not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search as this subject matter has already been examined and allowed. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests entry of the amendment, and reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Objection to Specification/Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The specification was objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 on the basis that the recited “statically pressurized fluid bearing” of previously presented claims 22-25 was not deemed to be disclosed. In conjunction with this objection to the specification, claims 22-25 were rejected under §112, first paragraph for failure to meet the written description requirement. This objection and rejection are respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the previous Response filed August 17, 2005, the phrase “statically pressurized fluid bearing” would be readily understood by the skilled artisan to describe a bearing which is pressurized by the application of pressurized fluid from an external source independent of translational or rotational movement of the bearing (hence “statically pressurized”), as compared to a “dynamically” pressurized bearing which is pressurized by mechanical rotation of a bearing surface, such as disclosed by Sanada '315.

Nevertheless, the Applicant has elected to clarify, without narrowing, claim 22 in order to place the case in immediate condition for allowance. This amendment is fully supported by the written description and serves to obviate the above objection and rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 22-25 were rejected as being anticipated by Sanada '315. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis that Sanada '315 failed to disclose a "statically pressurized fluid bearing," as previously presented. Nevertheless, it is clear that in view of the above amendment to claim 22, Sanada '315 fails to disclose a pressurized fluid "bearing configured to retain a pressurized fluid while maintaining the head in a stationary position." Reconsideration and allowance of the rejection of claims 22-25 are accordingly solicited.

Conclusion

This is intended to be a complete response to the final Office Action mailed September 29, 2005. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the above amendments, reconsider the application and allow all of the pending claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact the below signed Attorney should any questions arise concerning this response.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297
Mitchell K. McCarthy, Registration No. 38,794
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659
Customer No. 33900